

September 4, 1999
45 Bracewood Road
Waterbury, CT 06706
203/591-9177

capistrano@earthlink.net

Personal URL:

www.personal-expressions.net/users/don/

Secretary
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS
COMMISSION
The Portals
445 12th Street S.W.
Washington, DC 20554

RE: FCC DOCKET MM 99-25

Dear Commissioners and Commission Staff:

Enclosed are 15 copies, PLUS an Original, of INITIAL REPLY COMMENTS in Docket MM 99-25 (Low Power Radio Service). The same document has already been filed ELECTRONICALLY by John Robert Benjamin, Communications Director of THE AMHERST ALLIANCE.

These are INITIAL Reply Comments, designed primarily to convey information rather than arguments. I reserve the right to file Additional Reply Comments, on or before September 17, and currently expect to do so.

Based on past experience, I believe the Chart in the Appendix may be more readable in the hard copy than it is in the electronic copy.

Sincerely,

Don Schellhardt

TABLE OF CONTENTS
For
INITIAL REPLY COMMENTS
OF DON SCHELLHARDT
In
FCC DOCKET NO. MM 99-25

	Page
INTRODUCTION	1
LOW POWER RADIO IN 60 DIFFERENT AREAS	2
CONCLUSION	3

APPENDIX: "Profile of Low Power Radio 'Slots'
In 60 Different Areas"

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

The Portals

445 12th Street S.W.

WASHINGTON, DC

In The Matter Of:)	Docket MM 99-25
)	
Creation Of A)	Docket RM-9208;
Low Power Radio Service)	Docket RM-9242

INITIAL REPLY COMMENTS OF DON SCHELLHARDT

I am Don Schellhardt, a writer and legislative & regulatory attorney who resides at present in Waterbury, Connecticut. With Nickolaus and Judith Leggett of Reston, Virginia, I co-authored and co-filed the Petition For Rulemaking that triggered FCC Docket RM-9208. Later, I co-founded THE AMHERST ALLIANCE -- a small but nationwide citizens' group -- and was elected its current National Coordinator.

Amherst advocates a Low Power Radio Service ... supports the FCC Staff proposal for divestiture of certain radio stations ... opposes allocation of ANY radio station licenses by auction ... and favors a freer flow of information and ideas in radio and other mass media.

As an individual, I take the same position as Amherst on these issues. Despite this confluence, however, please treat these INITIAL REPLY

COMMENTS as strictly my own views. They speak for no one but me.

DON SCHELLHARDT

INITIAL REPLY COMMENTS

DOCKET MM 99-25

Page TWO

LOW POWER RADIO IN 60 DIFFERENT AREAS

The purpose of these INITIAL REPLY COMMENTS is not to make arguments but rather to convey information.

On August 8, 1999, I completed preparation of an analytical document for use by Members of THE AMHERST ALLIANCE. This document, entitled "Profile Of Low Power Radio 'Slots' In 60 Different Areas", is attached as an Appendix.

This document takes a look at information, provided to the NAB by the FCC, regarding the projected allocation of Low Power Radio licenses in each of 60 different metropolitan areas. These FCC estimates were used by the NAB as part of its study of alleged interference by Low Power Radio. (The study was then included in the NAB's August 2, 1999 Written Comments in this Docket.)

Since the "Profile" presents some of the available information in a way that MIGHT be new to the Commission, this document could perhaps spark new insights. In particular, the patterns found in this document's Chart reinforce the case for power ceilings which vary with population density and/or size.

Consider the RANGE of situations found over 60 metropolitan areas.

For LP-100 "slots", the high is 84 slots per area (Las Vegas), the low is

0 per area (New York City) and the average is 23 per area (Indianapolis). As for population per LP-100 slot, the high is 3,875,000 per slot (Chicago), the low is 2,000 per slot (Flagstaff) and the average is 79,000 per "slot" (Louisville).

DON SCHELLHARDT

INITIAL REPLY COMMENTS

DOCKET MM 99-25

Page THREE

For LP-1000 slots, the high is 24 slots per area (Flagstaff), the low is 0 per area (New York City, San Francisco, Chicago, Washington (DC), Detroit, Baltimore, Spokane and Cleveland) and the average is 6.8 per area (Miami and Grand Rapids). As for population per LP-1000 slot, the high is 9,206,000 per slot (Los Angeles), the low is 5,000 per slot (Flagstaff) and the average is 272,000 (Manchester(CT)/Hartford).

A comparably HUGE variation can be seen in the number of LP-100 slots that must be displaced in order to make room for a single LP-1000 slot. 8 is the high (Pittsburgh), 1 is the low (Boston) and 3.4 is the average (Atlanta, Mobile, Houston and Peoria).

Looking at these numbers, all drawn from the attached "Profile", it is hard to argue AGAINST allowing LP-1000s in metro Flagstaff. On the other hand, it is also hard to argue FOR allowing even LP-100s in metro Chicago.

The Amherst approach to power ceilings looks better than ever.

CONCLUSION

For the reasons set forth herein, I urge the Commission to review, carefully and thoughtfully, the attached Appendix: "Profile Of Low Power Radio 'Slots' In 60 Different Areas." I further urge the Commission to adopt the geographically varying power ceilings proposed by THE AMHERST ALLIANCE.

DON SCHELLHARDT

INITIAL REPLY COMMENTS

DOCKET MM 99-25

Page FOUR

Respectfully submitted,

Don Schellhardt

45 Bracewood Road
Waterbury, CT 06706

203/591-9177

capistrano@earthlink.net

Personal URL:

www.personal-expressions.net/users/don/

Dated: _____

September 4, 1999

I hereby certify that a copy of these Initial Reply Comments has been sent to each party who sent a copy of their Written Comments to me.

**PROFILE
OF LOW POWER RADIO “SLOTS”
IN 60 DIFFERENT AREAS**

In the course of preparing a study on PROJECTED “interference” from Low Power Radio stations, the National Association of Broadcasters (NAB) obtained vital information from the Federal Communications Commission (FCC). The NAB was given access to the FCC’s computer projections of how many Low Power Radio stations can be accommodated in each of 60 different areas that the NAB was studying. The FCC’s numbers, which were recently upgraded, assume relaxation of the 2nd and 3rd adjacent channel spacing requirements.

This information was then included in the NAB’s August 2, 1999 Written Comments to the FCC. Now we are passing this information on to you.

In its Written Comments, the NAB frequently refers to the 60 areas studied as “cities” -- BUT these territories are really the size of metropolitan areas. Collectively, the 60 areas are home for over 100 million people.

At the same time, bear in mind that a majority of the U.S.A.’s population -
- and a VAST majority of its land area -- is located OUTSIDE of these 60 areas.

SOURCES

For location of Low Power Radio “Slots”: The FCC, as quoted by the NAB.

For Population Data: PLACES RATED ALMANAC, 5TH EDITION by David Savageau and Geoffrey Loftus. Copyright 1997 by Simon and Schuster, Inc.

NOTATIONS

Numbers in **perpetua** type are 50% or more **ABOVE** The 60-Area Average for the relevant category.

Numbers in **eurostile** type are 50% or more **BELOW** The 60-Area Average for the relevant category.

For LP-100s, depending on the category AND whether the numbers are far above or far below the 60-Area Average, major deviations from the mid-points may suggest the need to add more LP-10s to a SPECIFIC area -- OR, at the other extreme, to set the Top Tier higher than LP-100 in that SPECIFIC area.

PROFILE OF LOW POWER RADIO STATIONS Page 2

(All Population In Thousands, Rounded)

Metro Area	1997 Metro Area Pop.*	Projected No. Of LP-100 Stations	Aver. Pop. Per Station**	Projected No. Of LP-1000 Stations	Aver. Pop. Per Station**	LP-100s Displaced By Each LP-1000
Las Vegas	1,774	84	14	19	62	4.4
Flagstaff	117	74	2	24	5	3.1
Albuquerque	705	67	11	16	44	4.2
Richmond	953	62	15	19	50	3.3
Wichita	518	54	10	19		37
3.3						
Tucson	788	52	15	14		56
3.7						
Phoenix	2,637	47	56	11	240	
4.3						

St. Louis 3.7	2,585	44	59	12	215	
San Antonio 3.2	1,504	42	36	13	116	
Nashville 3.9	1,132	39	29	10	113	
Jacksonville 2.9	1,003	38	26	13	77	
Columbus (OH) 3.4	1,491	37	40	9	166	4.1
Atlanta 3.4	3,531	37	95	11	321	
Oklahoma City 3.6	1,022	36	28	10	102	
Omaha 3.5	675	35	19	10	68	
Santa Barbara 1.9	390	35	11	18	22	
Mobile 3.4	524	34	15	10	52	
Midland/Odessa 2.1	243	34	7	18	15	
Miami	2,060	30	69	7	294	4.3
Boise	370	29	13	12	31	2.4
Cleveland NA	2,249	25	90	0	NA	
Little Rock 4.0	558	24	23	6	93	

PROFILE OF LOW POWER RADIO STATIONS

Page 3

(All Population In Thousands, Rounded)

Metro Area	1997 Metro Area	Projected No. Of LP-100	Aver. Pop. Per	Projected No. Of LP-1000	Aver. Pop. Per	LP-100s Displaced By Each
------------	-----------------------	-------------------------------	----------------------	--------------------------------	----------------------	---------------------------------

	Pop. *	Stations	Station **	Stations	Station **	LP-1000
Montgomery	319	24	13	9	35	2.7
Indianapolis	1,513	22	70	6	252	3.7
Cincinnati	1,625	18	90	4	406	4.5
Des Moines	428	18	24	10	43	1.8
Manchester (CT)/Hartford	1,148	18	64	4	287	4.5
Milwaukee	1,466	18	81	6	489	
3.0						
Kansas City	1,679	18	93	11	153	1.6
Houston	3,853	17	227	5	771	
3.4						
Peoria	347	17	20	5	69	3.4
Minneapolis	2,792	16	175	3	931	
5.3						
Salt Lake City	1,258	15	84	10	126	1.5
Springfield (MA)	576	14	41	4	144	3.5
Spokane	398	14	28	0	NA	
NA						
Baton Rouge	577	14	41	3	192	4.7
Charlotte	1,330	13	102	3	444	
4.3						
Louisville	995	13	77	4	249	3.3
La Crosse	125	13	10	5	25	2.6
Greenville (NC)	125	12	10	6	21	2.0
Grand Rapids	1,023	10	102	7	146	1.4
Raleigh	1,055	9	117	3	352	3.0
Denver	1,096	9	212	3	635	
3.0						
Dallas	3,047	9	339	2	1,524	
4.5						
Baltimore	2,534	9	282	0	NA	
NA						

Philadelphia	5,025	8	628	2	2,513
4.0					
Pittsburgh	2,411	8	302	1	2,411
8.0					

PROFILE OF LOW POWER RADIO STATIONS

Page 4

(All Population Is In Thousands, Rounded)

Metro Area	1997 Metro Area Pop. *	Projected No. Of LP-100 Stations	Aver. Pop. Per Station**	Projected No. Of LP-1000 Stations	Aver. Pop. Per Stations **	LP-100s Displaced By Each LP-1000
Orlando	1,520	8	190	5	304	1.6
Manchester						
(NH)	179	7	26	1	179	7.0
Harrisburg	627	6	105	4	157	1.5
San Diego	2,797	6	466	2	1,399	
3.0						
Trenton	332	4	83	2	166	2.0
Los Angeles	9,206	4	2,302	1	9,206	
4.0						
Detroit	4,355	4	1,089	0	NA	
NA						
San Jose	1,612	4	403	2	812	
2.0						
Washington,						
DC	4,643	4	1,161	0	NA	
NA						
Boston	3,247	4	812	4	812	
1.0						

Chicago	7,750	2	3,875	0	NA
NA					
San Francisco	1,665	2	833	0	NA
NA					
New York	8,592	0	NA	0	NA
NA					

60-AREA TOTALS

110,309	1,391	NA	405	NA	NA
---------	-------	----	-----	----	----

60-AREA AVERAGES

1,838	23	79	6.8	272	3.4
+ 50% =	2,757	34	119	10.2	
409	5.1				
Minus 50% =	919	11	40	3.4	136
1.7					

PROFILE OF LOW POWER RADIO STATIONS

Page 5

* This is 1997 population data for the applicable Standard Metropolitan Statistical Area (SMSA). The SMSA is a Census Bureau concept, under which the Bureau groups together individual communities with common economic and infrastructure links to a central urban core.

For purposes of understanding the projected geographical allocation of Low Power Radio licenses BY THE FCC, please regard the SMSA data as AN APPROXIMATION ONLY. The FCC data, as used by the NAB in its study of PROJECTED interference, covers territories in the SIZE RANGE of metropolitan areas -- but the actual communities examined may not correspond PRECISELY to the applicable SMSA boundaries, as defined by the Census Bureau.

PLEASE NOTE AS WELL that, in the case of VERY large stretches of urban and suburban development, the Census Bureau sometimes subdivides the stretch into 2 or more ADJOINING SMSAs. For example, the 8,592,000 people in the New York City/Westchester County SMSA do not include the 1,940,000 people in the Newark (NJ) SMSA, the 2,661,000 people in the Long Island SMSA or the 333,000 people in the Lower Fairfield County (CT) SMSA. The 9,206,000 people in the Los Angeles (City & County) SMSA do not include

the 744,000 people in the Ventura County SMSA, the 3,081,000 people in the Riverside/San Bernardino SMSA or the 2,689,000 people in the Orange County SMSA.

** To generate this number, the APPROXIMATE human population for a specific geographical area, as tabulated by the Census Bureau for the applicable SMSA, has been divided by the projected number of Low Power Radio stations. This yields the AVERAGE number of humans in an area for each station. Period. This number, EVEN MORE than the population number for the overall SMSA, should be regarded as AN APPROXIMATION ONLY.

For example, there is no reason to assume Reception Contours will produce UNIFORMLY SIZED potential audiences. This is HIGHLY improbable.

Further, sometimes there may not be applicants for ALL of the available licenses. For example, the FCC estimates there is room for 74 LP-100 stations in the Flagstaff area. However, AMHERST ANALYSIS shows the potential audience averages only 2,000 people per station. Since financial sustainability is difficult with such a small audience, full time, UNsubsidized broadcasters may stop seeking licenses BEFORE potential audiences fall to this level.

PREPARED
For Members Of
THE AMHERST ALLIANCE

DJS/djs
August 8, 1999